

In the Claims:

Please remove claims 19-22 from examination without prejudice.

REMARKS

In the Office Action of May 4, 2001, the Examiner required restriction of prosecution to one of the following inventions: Group I containing claims 1-18, 23-27 and Group II containing claims 19-22. In response, Applicants are provisionally electing Group I with traverse.

To require election/restriction under MPEP § 806.05(d), "The examiner must show, by way of example, that one of the subcombinations has utility other than the disclosed combination" (see MPEP § 806.05(d)). Applicants submit that the election/restriction requirement here is improper because the Examiner failed to show that the inventions in Groups I and II have separate utilities.

Specifically in Group I, claims 1-7, 9-12 and 16-18, are drawn to a method of *rendering a graphic primitive*. Claim 8 is drawn to an electronically-readable medium storing a program for permitting a computer to perform the method as described in claim 1. Claim 13 is drawn to an electronically-readable medium storing a program for permitting a computer to perform the method as described in claim 9. Claim 14 or 15 is drawn to a system for *rendering a graphic primitive*. It should be noted that *both claims 14 and 15 recite, inter alia, an interpolation engine, which is the claimed invention in Group II*. Claims 23-26 are drawn to a method of generating interpolated values for use in *rendering a graphic primitive*. Claim 27 is drawn to an electronically-

readable medium storing a program for permitting a computer to perform the method as described in claim 23.

In Group II, claims 19-22 are drawn to an *interpolation engine* for use in a graphic system. The interpolation engine comprises a ratio pipe configured to a ratio value associated with a point in a graphic primitive or in an edge of the graphic primitive and a blending pipe configured to output interpolated values of texture coordinates. It should be noted that the interpolated values of texture coordinates generated by the interpolation engine are used to *determine values of any interior point within a graphic primitive* (see the Specification, page 14, lines 24-25; page 20, lines 3-5 and lines 12-14; page 20, line 20 – page 21, line 2; and page 21, lines 8-13). It should also be noted that the *interpolation engine* in claims 19-22 of Group II is recited as an element in claims 14 and 15 of Group I.

Applicants submit that even though the claims in Group I and Group II cover different scope and aspect of the present invention, they are directed to *a common inventive effort or concept*, that is, to use “direct interpolation to generate a value for any point in a graphic primitive without necessarily traversing other portions of the primitive” (see the Specification, page 5, lines 6-8). In addition, the claims in Group I and Group II have *a common utility*, that is, to interpolate “values in primitives without requiring separate hardware for the setup and rasterization stages” (see the Specification, page 5, lines 5-6). Furthermore, Applicants submit that the examination of the claims in Groups I and II does not require different fields of search.

To support the election/restriction requirement, the Examiner stated in the Office Action that "invention I has separate utility such as merging or overlaying video signals to generate a composite graphic image" and "invention II has separate utility such as scaling of video image signals for a scaled graphic image." Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants respectfully submit that the different functions performed by the claims in Group I and Group II are not separate utilities. Rather, they reflect *different aspects of a common utility* in the present invention, that is, to interpolate "values in graphic primitives without requiring separate hardware for the setup and rasterization stages" (see the Specification, page 5, lines 5-6).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the election/restriction requirement be withdrawn upon reconsideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Konstantine Iourcha et al.

Date: 7/1/01

By: Susan Yee

Susan Yee, Reg. No. 41,388

Carr & Ferrell LLP

2225 East Bayshore Road, Suite 200

Palo Alto, CA 94303

Phone: (650) 812-3400

Fax: (650) 812-3444